

REC'D	0	4	MAR	2005

WIPO PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference C02048WO International application No. PCT/EP 03/12369		FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)				
		International filing date (day/month/year) 06.11.2003		Priority date (day/month/year) 08.11.2002		
	nationa G61/C		nt Classification (IPC) or t	ooth national classification	and IPC	
Appli CO\		ORG	ANIC SEMICONDU	CTORS GMBH et al.		
1.	This Auth	intern ority a	ational preliminary exa and is transmitted to th	mination report has be applicant according to	en prepared by this o Article 36.	International Preliminary Examining .
2.	2. This REPORT consists of a total of 4 sheets, including this cover sheet.					
		beer	n amended and are the	anied by ANNEXES, i.e basis for this report an on 607 of the Administra	d/or sheets containi	ription, claims and/or drawings which have ng rectifications made before this Authority der the PCT).
	Thes	se anr	nexes consist of a total	of sheets.		
3.	This	repor	t contains indications	elating to the following	items:	
3.	This			elating to the following	items:	
3.	1	×	Basis of the opinion	elating to the following	items:	
3.	1 11		Basis of the opinion Priority			tep and industrial applicability
3.	1 11 111		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o	f opinion with regard to		ep and industrial applicability
3.	1 11		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement	f opinion with regard to	novelty, inventive st	tep and industrial applicability by, inventive step or industrial applicability;
3.	I II III IV	⊠ □ □	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement	f opinion with regard to ition under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v itions supporting such s	novelty, inventive st	
3.	I II IV V		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents of	f opinion with regard to ition under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v itions supporting such s	novelty, inventive st with regard to novelt statement	
3.	I II IV V		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to ntion under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ntions supporting such s ited	novelty, inventive st with regard to novelt statement	
3.	I II IV V VI VII		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to ation under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ations supporting such s ited a international application	novelty, inventive st with regard to novelt statement	
	 V 		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to ation under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ations supporting such s ited a international application	novelty, inventive st with regard to novelt statement	y, inventive step or industrial applicability;
Date	 V 		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the Certain observations	f opinion with regard to ation under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) v ations supporting such s ited a international application	novelty, inventive statement on plication	y, inventive step or industrial applicability;
Date 08.	I II IV V VI VIII VIII 06.20	Domission 04	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the Certain observations	f opinion with regard to ation under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) witions supporting such s ited international application on the international ap	novelty, inventive statement on plication Date of completion	ry, inventive step or industrial applicability;

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP 03/12369

I.	Ba	sis	of	the	rep	ort
----	----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

	De	scription, Pages					
	1-3	32	as originally filed				
	01.						
	Cla	nims, Numbers					
	1-2	4	as originally filed				
2.	Wit lan	With regard to the language , all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
	The	ese elements were av	ailable or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:				
		the language of a tra	anslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).				
	the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).						
			anslation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under				
3.	. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:						
		contained in the inte	rnational application in written form.				
		filed together with th	e international application in computer readable form.				
			ntly to this Authority in written form.				
		furnished subsequer	ntly to this Authority in computer readable form.				
	The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disc in the international application as filed has been furnished.						
		The statement that the listing has been furn	he information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence ished.				
4.	The	amendments have re	esulted in the cancellation of:				
		the description,	pages:				
		the claims,	Nos.:				
		the drawings,	sheets:				
5.		This report has been been considered to g	established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have so beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).				
		(Any replacement sh report.)	eet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this				
6.	Add	itional observations, i	f necessary:				

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP 03/12369

- V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- 1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-24

No:

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

Claims

No: Claims

1-24

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-24

No: Claims

- 2. Citations and explanations
 - see separate sheet

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET

International application No. PCT/EP 03/12369

1. Artikel 33 (2) PCT:

D1 offenbart Polytetraalkylindenofluorene, deren Herstellung sowie Verwendung in OLEDs; **D2** beschreibt die Herstellung und Verwendung der entsprechenden PIF-Copolymere. **D3** und **D4** offenbaren Step-Ladder Polyfluorene mit steifen Aryl-Seitenketten. Da keines der Dokumente die PIF-Polymere mit speziellen Seitenketten (Aryl-seitenketten oder gemischte Aryl-Alkylseitenketten) offenbart, ist der Gegenstand der Ansprüche 1-24 neu.

2. Artikel 33 (3) PCT:

Das Dokument D1 wird als nächster Stand der Technik betrachtet, da es ebenfalls Polyindenofluorene zur Benützung in OLEDs offenbart. Der Unterschied der vorliegenden Anmeldung zu D1 ist die Verwendung von speziellen Aryl-oder Heteroarylsubstituenten bzw. gemischten Aryl-Alkylseitenketten R1-R4. Da es aus den Dokumenten D3 und D4 jedoch bekannt ist, dass Arylseitenketten bei Polyfluorenen zu verbesserten optischen Eigenschaften und Device-Performances in OLEDs führen und D1 die Verwandschaft von PF und PIF hervorhebt, ist der Gegenstand der Ansprüche 1-24 nicht erfinderisch.

3. Artikel 6 PCT:

Die Formulierung "without departing from the spirit and scope of the present invention..., p. 32" sollte gestrichen werden, um den Gegenstand des Schutzbegehrens zu limitieren.